

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

PRESTON EUGENE MARTIN-
RICHARDSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

KING COUNTY CORRECTIONAL
FACILITY, et al.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:22-cv-00025-RSM-BAT

**ORDER STRIKING MOTION FOR
PRODUCTION**

Plaintiff filed a “Motion for Production of Documents” requesting Defendant provide Plaintiff with ten separate items. Dkt. 32. The Court construes this pleading to be Plaintiff’s initial request that Defendants provide discovery, and not a “Motion” to compel discovery. Plaintiff should note that a discovery request is normally **not** filed with the Court but instead must be served upon the opposing party.

Plaintiff should also note that a “motion” for discovery should not be filed unless the opposing party fails to provide discovery, and the parties have met and conferred in an attempt to resolve the discovery dispute. Hence, if a dispute over discovery arises, Plaintiff must certify in any motion to compel discovery he files, that the parties have met and conferred in an attempt to resolve the dispute. The Court will normally summarily deny a motion to compel discovery that lacks a certification that the parties have met and conferred.

1 The Court accordingly **ORDERS:**

2 (1) Plaintiff's Motion for Production, Dkt. 32, is stricken.

3 (2) The Clerk shall provide a copy of this order to the parties.

4 DATED this 28th day of December, 2022.

5
6 

7 BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA
8 United States Magistrate Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23